



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/022,578	12/17/2001	Bhaskar Sinha	ONET-0101 PUS	6146

27256 7590 08/23/2005

ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.
28333 TELEGRAPH RD.
SUITE 250
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48034

EXAMINER

POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/022,578

Applicant(s)

SINHA ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey D. Popham

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 December 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Remarks

Claims 1-23 are pending.

Oath/Declaration

1. Applicant has not given a post office address anywhere in the application papers as required by 37 CFR 1.33(a), which was in effect at the time of filing of the oath or declaration. A statement over applicant's signature providing a complete post office address is required.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description:

- Figure 4: reference number 108.
- Figure 5: reference number 112.
- Figure 6: reference number 122.
- Figure 8: reference number 136.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being

Art Unit: 2137

amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as they are replete with errors including use of language that makes the claim scope and meaning unclear, inconsistencies within the claims, and antecedent basis problems that stem from incorrect dependencies, misspellings, etc. For the examples, the examiner is using the line numbers read on the left hand side of the claim pages.

Examples are as follows:

- Claim 1, lines 26-27 read "in response to the packet, authenticating the user at the head end server". For purposes of prior art rejection, it has been construed as "in response to receiving the packet, authenticating the user at the head end server".
- Claim 1, lines 28-29 read "providing the packet to the user privilege proxy".
There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For

- purposes of prior art rejection, it has been construed as “providing the packet to the user privilege server proxy”.
- Claim 2, lines 2-3 read “negotiating the authentication scheme”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. For purposes of prior art rejection, it has been construed as “negotiating an authentication scheme”.
 - Claim 3, lines 1-2 read “A method as recited in claim 1 wherein negotiating an authentication scheme”. It is clear that this should be dependent upon claim 2, where the step of negotiating an authentication scheme is first claimed.
 - Claim 4 reads “A method as recited in claim 1 wherein the step of validating comprises validating in accordance with the authentication scheme.” In claim 1, there are multiple recitations of validating, so it is unclear as to which one applicant intends for claim 4 to refer to. For purposes of prior art rejection, it has been assumed that this refers to the validation at lines 12-13 of claim 1. Also, there is insufficient antecedent basis for “the authentication scheme” in the claims. For purposes of prior art rejection, claim 4 has been construed as being dependent upon claim 2.
 - Claim 8, lines 14-15 read “presenting the user information to a head end server”. In the preamble, there is a head end server already claimed, and when viewed in conjunction with the other claims, it has been construed that both of these head end servers are, indeed, the same, as can be written “presenting the user information to the head end server”.

Art Unit: 2137

- Claim 11, lines 2-3 read "generating a ticket by encrypting the user". It is unclear as to what is meant by this statement, and has been construed as "generating a ticket by encryption".

These are only examples, as there are many more errors in the claims, all of which must be corrected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grantges (U.S. Patent 6,324,648) in view of Wood (U.S. Patent 6,609,198).

Regarding Claim 8,

Grantges discloses a method of authenticating a user having a user privilege server proxy (client computer/browser) for a network system having a privilege server (authorization server/certificate authority), a head end server (proxy server) and a web adapter (application gateway) comprising:

Negotiating an authentication scheme between the user privilege server proxy and privilege server (Column 4, lines 33-65);

Presenting user information to the web adapter (Column 12, line 57 to Column 13, line 17);

Presenting the user information to the head end server (Column 12, line 57 to Column 13, line 17);

Presenting the user information to the privilege server from the head end server (Column 12, line 57 to Column 13, line 17);

Validating the user at the privilege server in response to receiving the user information in accordance with the authentication scheme (Column 13, lines 8-41);

When the user is validated, generating a ticket for the user at the privilege server (Column 13, lines 8-41);

Encrypting the ticket with a user password to form an encrypted ticket (Column 7, line 63 to Column 8, line 14);

Providing the encrypted ticket to the user privilege server proxy through the head end server (Column 13, lines 18-41);

Decrypting the encrypted ticket (Column 7, line 63 to Column 8, line 14; and Column 13, lines 18-41);

Forming a service access request token from the ticket and user identification at the user privilege server proxy (Column 8, lines 16-28);

Sending the token from the user privilege server proxy to the privilege server (Column 8, line 29 to Column 9, line 18);

Validating the user in response to receiving the token (Column 9, lines 6-18);

Providing the packet to the head end server (Column 9, lines 6-18);

In response to receiving the packet, authenticating the user at the head end server (Column 9, lines 6-18; and Column 10, lines 6-25);

Providing the packet to the user privilege server proxy (Column 10, lines 6-25);

Sending the ticket and sequence number encrypted with the session key to a service server through the web adapter (Column 8, lines 40-51; and Column 11, line 63 to Column 12, line 10);

Validating the user at the service server (Column 11, lines 13-30);

Granting the user role based privileges at the service server (Column 11, line 63 to Column 12, line 10).

Grantges does not disclose forming a packet having a sequence number and session key encrypted with the ticket at the privilege server or decrypting this packet.

Wood, however, discloses validating the user in response to receiving the token (Column 12, line 52 to Column 13, line 10); forming a packet having a sequence number and session key encrypted with the ticket at the privilege server (Column 12, line 52 to Column 13, line 10); and decrypting the packet (Column 13, lines 27-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the credential level change system of Wood into the secure gateway of Grantges in order to allow credentials to be upgraded and downgraded as needed within the same session, so that a high security, overcredentialled log-on state is not required and need not be maintained (Column 2, lines 47-67).

Regarding Claim 1,

Claim 1 is a method claim that is broader than method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 2,

Claim 2 is a method claim that is broader than method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 4,

Claim 4 is a method claim that is broader than method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 5,

Claim 5 is a method claim that is broader than method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 6,

Claim 6 is a method claim that is broader than method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 7,

Claim 7 is a method claim that is broader than method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 13,

Claim 13 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 14,

Claim 14 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 22,

Claim 22 is a system claim that is broader than method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 23,

Claim 23 is a method claim that is broader than method claim 8 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 9,

Grantges discloses that negotiating an authentication scheme between the user privilege server proxy and privilege server comprises presenting at least one security mechanism from the user privilege server proxy to the privilege server; and accepting or rejecting the at least one security mechanism at the privilege server (Column 4, lines 33-65).

Regarding Claim 3,

Claim 3 is a method claim that is broader than method claim 9 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding Claim 10,

Grantges discloses that the step of validating at the privilege server is performed by a policy engine within the privilege server (Column 7, lines 29-44).

Regarding Claim 11,

Grantges discloses that generating a ticket comprises generating a ticket by encryption (Column 7, line 63 to Column 8, line 14).

Regarding Claim 12,

Claim 12 is a method claim that is broader than method claim 8, except for the steps of including a session name and choosing a service in the service server. Grantges discloses including a session name (Column 10, lines 32-53) and choosing a service in the service server (Column 9, lines 19-34).

Regarding Claim 15,

Grantges discloses that the user information comprises a user identification number (Column 14, lines 43-65).

Regarding Claim 16,

Grantges discloses that the privilege server has a policy engine therein (Column 7, lines 29-44).

Regarding Claim 17,

Grantges discloses that the privilege server comprises a key generator coupled to the policy engine (Column 12, line 52 to Column 13, line 10; and Column 15, lines 1-25).

Regarding Claim 18,

Grantges discloses that the privilege server comprises a proxy coordinator coupled to the policy engine (Column 9, lines 6-18).

Regarding Claim 19,

Grantges discloses that the privilege server comprises an obfuscator/deobfuscator coupled to the policy engine (Column 7, line 63 to Column 8, line 14).

Regarding Claim 20,

Grantges discloses that the privilege server comprise a store keeper coupled to the policy engine (Column 7, lines 29-44).

Regarding Claim 21,

Grantges discloses that the store keeper comprises a user information list (Column 7, lines 29-44).

Wood discloses that the store keeper comprises a user information list and a session information list (Column 12, line 52 to Column 13, line 10).

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2137

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER